

Ramona Village Design Committee  
Meeting Minutes June 1, 2005

Present: Woods (chair), Lewallen (vice-chair), Wylie, Angus, Kesinger, Hagey, Kiehne-Lamkin, Salvatore, Roberson (arrived late) Anderson

Excused Absence: DeMund

Meeting was called to order at 7:10 pm

Minute: Motion to approve minutes by Anderson, then withdrawn to trail them to the end of the meeting as Kesinger wanted to review at the end.

Lewallen: Report on Design Review Board Standards Meeting:

See minutes from meeting

Hagey: need a tree every 30 ft in parking lots. Maybe we could specify the tree species

Anderson: Sign grand fathering? Have you discussed that?

Lewallen: More info will be reported on that subject. The committee did not address it as a whole. Personal feeling was no more grandfathering. Once the proponent changes anything they have to come into compliance.

Mike: Will get us signage change language as reference to use and grand fathering language.

Hagey: Can someone still choose to follow the standards of old town even if it is not in old town?

Lewallen: Sure, except for setback and areas that is more lenient.

7:24 Roberson Arrived

-Close Design Review Update-

Item 4: Considerations of Revised Study Area Boundaries

Placed on next agenda, as it will impact the areas by the linear park, 14<sup>th</sup> and one area around North of K-Mart. It will be presented and discussed at the next meeting.

Item 5: Recap from Dahvia from Village Design

Wylie: Hallmark Homes on H St. She would like to be able to review the houses before they are developed for design standards if there are more than 3 being built. Ryland Homes came before the DRB but they had already had their designs. She would like to have them go to DRB at onset.

Lewallen: The current guidelines state that the DRB reviews developments of 14 du/ac and above.

Woods: Maybe we should look at a revision of 7 du/ac.

Woods: Senior housing behind McDonalds on 16<sup>th</sup> and off Raymond/Kelly.

Kiehne-Lamkin: Wants to make sure it's not discriminatory to make it exclusive senior housing

Anderson: It's not discriminatory. How is 1212 H St. a senior mobile home park if it's discriminatory? There are mechanisms that allow for senior housing. HUD.

Woods: Would like Kiehne-Lamkin & Anderson to work together on this. Found that we can have incentives vs. regulations and they will get us what we want.

Kesinger: Would like to have it legally placed into the code. Incentives verses regulations. Wants to see the incentives and how they work before he signs on.

Woods: If the standards of development were high enough, he would like to see it done. We would have to raise the height limit of the county. This would not be a waving of some magic wand and it happens... It would be hard work.

Salvatore: Convalescent? This wouldn't be enough land if so. This is what he used to build. They need to have a variety of options. Independent living verses convalescent, we have to make something feasible for them to afford for their quality of life.

Woods: That type of development would require a MUP and is not what we are discussing.

Anderson: At the last RCPG meeting the owner of the targeted land came before us and presented a project on the property that was not senior housing. I asked him if he was aware that we wanted to make it senior housing and he said "no". How can we make the owners of these parcels know what we are trying to do?

Angus: Schools. Where are they going? Somewhere we need to find a way to fit in a development of a school.

Kesinger: Does not advocate the 40 du/ac. 2 per acre is more reasonable.

Salvatore: We have to do what the majority of Ramona wants and not what we want to see. The senior can't afford 2 per acre. We have to drop the costs. Once they retire they are on fixed incomes.

Kesinger: Doesn't want 40 du/ac. That can drift to other housing at 40 du/ac. He doesn't think there would be any support from the community at 40 du/ac.

Woods: We can set up criteria for seniors exclusively without breaking the law.

Wylie: We should blend some independent and assisted living.

Angus: She was on the Sheriff's Department Senior Patrol and was witness to the "You are not Alone" program. You would be appalled to see how many elderly are currently living in Ramona and who need this type of housing. We have to compromise.

Lewallen: He has seen some pretty decent stuff around San Diego without raising it up a whole bunch... maybe only 5 ft.

Woods: We all need to snap some pictures and keep it to San Diego County for comparison purposes. Then bring back to the group.

Mike: Break down what you don't like about the 40 du/ac and then deal with it with design standards. It won't function like a 40 du/ac of apartments if it's for seniors. They can find a way to make it fit with our community.

#### Single Family Recommendations:

Kesinger: In favor of incentives for higher densities when developing.

Anderson: Should be blended like the Cummings Ranch proposed. They created it so that the outer homes are larger lots and the interior lots were smaller. The town doesn't see the density impact that way. Outer lots are 1 to 2 acres and interior are third to 1 acre lots. That would create a buffer.

Hagey: Porches. Can we get more porches?

Roberson: **Motion:**

Create a base that is at 7.3 and build in incentives to get the higher density of a maximum of 14.5 per acre, excluding senior housing. Those incentives would be defined in the design review standards and are for the undeveloped lands of multi-density units of today. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Angus

7 Yes, 1 No (Kesinger), 2 abstain (Kiehne-Lamkin & Salvatore) **Motion Passed.**

Kesinger: This intent is okay but it removes any elected body from weighing in and it is only approved by the Design Review Board.

Woods: No, it would still have to pass RCPG and BOS

Roberson: Quality of life for both the people living in the community and the Ramona community as a whole.

Woods: We had 24 du until GP2020.

Dahvia: Gave clarification as to how the zoning/land use would be written.

Mike: Standards such as porches, trees etc. are all part of design standards.

Kiehne-Lamkin: What is the total acreage we are talking about?

Dahvia: Showed map and roughly calculated 80 to 90 acres.

**-MIXED USE-**

Woods: Do we want it? His understanding of what we are talking about is commercial (minimum of 51%) with residential (max of 49%). Do we want to take a position on this?

Kesinger: Only if it has limited uses, like only if it is for art studios or something like that on Main Street.

Anderson: That's Discriminatory. I support mixed use but not on Main Street.

Kesinger: **Motion:**  
**That we do not endorse mixed use on Main Street. 2<sup>nd</sup> Angus**

Roberson: It should be on A, B, & D.

Salvatore: Wants upper level okay for residential.

Anderson: None on Main Street okay off Main.

Lewallen: Won't support if it went to parcel. None on Main Street Residential component cannot face Main Street.

Roberson: We need to have to layer the use on Main Street but not let the residential component face Main Street. Leave in the component. Residential may not be visible from Main Street.

Wylie: Maybe the percentage could be 25% if on Main Street.

Woods: No mixed use on Main Street; as defined as commercial only on Main Street, residential would not be visible from Main Street for parcels that are half block deep.

**VOTE: 4 Yes and 6 No Motion Failed**

**Roberson: Motion:**  
We support mixed use including Main Street with no residential visible from Main Street and residential as secondary use. Anderson Second  
**8 Yes & 2 No (Kiehne-Lamkin & Kesinger) Motion Passed.**

Mike to break down into 3 geographic residential mixed-use languages.

Do we support Mixed Use?

Wylie: Motion:

On Commercial area we allow mixed use with commercial & residential with residential as a secondary use at 49% max. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Kiehne-Lamkin

Lewallen: Are we talking about all the area?

Wylie: B & D not quite sure about where to end the area. 3<sup>rd</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> Street and A, B, D & E Streets. (Motion revised to include these areas and revision was accepted by both maker and 2nd)

8 Yes, 1 No (Kesinger) 1 Abstain (Lewallen)

Woods: Now what about 14<sup>th</sup> to Etcheverry? Do we want any there?

Roberson: Doesn't support making it linear. Keep it in the center of town. Make it fatter.

Angus: motion:

We do not extend the mixed use to the areas from 14<sup>th</sup> to Etcheverry Street. Salvatore 2<sup>nd</sup>

8 Yes, 1 No (Lewallen) 1 Abstain (Anderson)

### **River Park Area sites for restaurants?**

Lewallen: Limit commercial along the creek side area.

Wylie: Can't do restaurants because of the extensive parking criteria... we need incentives.

Lewallen: There is an opportunity to have some be community parking for all the restaurants.

Salvatore: North side for hiking, trails, bikes, etc.

Woods: Mike please write something that would allow some restaurants along the river park area. Then we can decide how to craft a motion around that.

Salvatore: Please get us maps of all the big maps brought by Dahvia tonight.

### **-Meeting Minutes-**

Kesinger: Kesinger has one "s".

Page 4 doesn't capture what he said. Kesinger to provide language to Anderson via email to be corrected in these minutes.

Kesinger: Motion to approve minutes as amended. 2<sup>nd</sup> by Salvatore  
Unanimous approval

We need to get Trail Loop from Dahvia.

Dawn Perfect:

Item 5: Once built out at 40 du/ac how to stop it from converting from senior to non-senior?

School issues: Encourage displacement? What did you decide?

Density Bonus- Other factors than design should weigh in.

Mixed Use- No residential access from Main Street.

Tom- RICC committee meeting tomorrow to pick a consultant to carry this project forward.

Woody Kirkman- 90 undeveloped acres that density would mean 1300 homes. Street access for residential shouldn't be from Main Street. The LOS is dropping.

The potential loss of tax base by mixed use. You're eliminating 50% of your tax base from that base.

Does this Group Sunset?

Beverly Ragsdale:

Senior housing concerns. Building is so high. Can't compare old vs. new. May need to go from 40 to 80 du/ac and that's scary.

Mixed use is very scary. Look at A & B streets and all the apartments.

Carol Close:

What a lot of people don't understand is that Gary Monetta will be getting government money to build senior housing. Section 8 will help his funding. Isn't right now on "D" Street Aren't they already mixed use?

Meeting adjourned at 9:42 pm